DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 876 HE 011 308

AUTHOR	Linney, Thomas J.
TITLE	Changing Values in Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, April 1979.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	5p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($.40)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; College Students; Educational Policy; Equal Education; *Federal Aid; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Middle Class College Students; Parental Financial Contribution; Public Opinion; Student Costs; *Student Financial Aid; *Trend Analysis; Values
IDENTIFIERS	Information Analysis Products; *Need Analysis (Student Financial Aid)

ABSTRACT

Current issues concerning changing values in higher education in relationship to existing programs and policies are considered. The following questions are addressed: Is there a middle income squeeze? Is there evidence of decreasing rates of participation among middle-income families in higher education? Is there evidence of substantial decreases in parental support? If so, what are the consequences and implications for higher education? Studies are cited which both support and disclaim the existence of financial pressures on middle-income families affecting their participation in higher education. Another consideration relevant to participation rates of middle-income families is the availability of student financial aid. New federal programs are expanding student assistance to more families in middle-income levels. Federal policy continues to call for equal access and provides for income distribution that supports a pluralistic system of higher education. It is projected that there will be a continued shifting of the burden of financing higher education from individuals to the federal and state governments. This represents a changing value toward higher education. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED169876

RESEARCH CURRENTS

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education
April 1979

CHANGING VALUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By Thomas J. Linney

Introduction

In the years following World War II the continued expansion of the U.S. economy and population brought prestige, growth, and satisfaction to the higher education community. The goal of extending access or equality of educational opportunity has been central to the expansion of higher education during this period. This process began during the Truman administration when the goal of equal opportunity first appeared on the national agenda:

> Equal educational opportunity for all persons, to the maximum of their individual abilities and without regard to economic status, race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or ancestry is a major goal of American democracy. Only an informed, thoughtful, tolerant people can maintain and develop a free society.
>
> Equal opportunity for education does not mean equal or identical education for all individuals. It means, rather, that education at all levels shall be available equally to every qualified person.
>
> (U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education, Vol. 2, 1947, p. 3).

Throughout the past three decades, federal programs of support for higher education grew as the federal government responded to increasing public pressures for opportunity in higher education. The passage of the 1972 Higher Education Amendments and the creation of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program made the matter of access to higher education one of national policy. Policy research on these matters, which in itself has expanded in the years since the passage of the 1972 amendments, helped to define the parameters for measuring access. The National Commission on the Financing of Higher Education defined access as allowing each citizen to "enroll in some form of post-secondary education appropriate to that person's needs, capability, and motivation" (1973 p. 55).

Federal expenditures in support of these policies have grown to unprecedented levels. Federal programs of student assistance, categorical aid programs for higher education and tax benefits for higher education totaled $13.8 billion in fiscal year 1977 (Finn 1978), with further increases in this total to be expected in future years. The passage in the closing hours of the 95th Congress of the Middle Income Student Assistance (MISA) Act of 1978 will serve to further expand the federal role in support of higher education through student assistance programs.

Debate over MISA produced a tide of information in relation to existing federal policy initiatives. It is apparent from this current research that values toward higher education may be undergoing major changes. Programs and levels of aid for the poorest segments of the society continue to expand, supporting the goals of equal access. Yet inflation and large increases in higher education costs have increasingly provoked outcries from middle class families that they are being squeezed out of the opportunities for higher education that exist for other segments of the national community (Lynch 1977; "Private Colleges Cry Help," 1979).

This paper will discuss some of the current issues that consider changing values in higher education in relationship to existing programs and policies:

- Is there a middle income squeeze?
- Is there evidence of decreasing rates of participation among middle income families in higher education?
- Is there evidence of substantial decreases in parental support?
- If so, what are the consequences and implications for higher education?

Middle Income: Context and Problems

Middle income is a difficult concept to define. One problem is that incomes of equal size may have considerably different purchasing power in different areas of the country. A second problem is that middle income is a relative concept and therefore effected by inflation. In this discussion middle income is assumed to include families with a 1979 income between $15,000 and $25,000 in 1979. The Congressional Budget Office (1978b) estimates this range includes approximately the middle one-third of families in the United States. This range has been adjusted for inflation. A comparison with 1967 dollar values as compiled by the Census Bureau (1978) would yield the following information:

1967 dollars	1976 dollars
$5000	$8525
$7500	$12,788
$10,000	$17,050
$15,000	$25,575

(U.S. Bureau of Census 1978, p. 6)

In 1978, there was considerable discussion in the country that the middle class was being squeezed out of higher education. Two possible solutions were presented in the Congress; tax credits and middle-income assistance aid. Advanced in both houses of Congress was a plan to grant tuition tax credits as additional aid to meeting the costs of higher education. An alternative plan presented by the Carter administration was to modify existing programs of student aid to include middle-income students.

The issue is this: college costs are rising at a rate equal to or greater than inflation; most federal aid programs were designed and targeted to be need-based and serve disadvantaged segments of the population; therefore, the middle-income segments of the population may be being squeezed out of opportunities for higher education by a combination of rising costs and lack of access to the major federal programs of student assistance.

Under the enacted MISA program, current programs like The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG), Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG), College Work-Study (CWS) Program and Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL) would be expanded in two ways. First, by increased appropriations and second, by raising the levels of income that determined eligibility for federal assistance. Thus, in the BEOG program the size of the maximum grant was increased from $1,600 to

Research Currents is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view of opinions of either AAHE or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Research Currents may be ordered for 40¢ each from the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

Thomas J. Linney is a Research Associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

$1,800 annually and the maximum adjusted family income level for participation in the program was raised from $17,000 to $25,000. All this was done, at least in part, to expand the nature of federal student assistance programs that were initially targeted to the poorest segments of society to include middle-income families.

All the debate surrounding eventual passage of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1978 (MISA) served to provide much information and little resolution of the inherent assumptions behind both proposals for middle-income student assistance.

The question still remains: are middle income students truly experiencing a financial squeeze or is it just a change in the willingness of middle class families to pay for college costs.

Middle Income: No Squeeze

The Census Bureau (1978) has noted that overall enrollment rates have remained relatively stable for the period from 1967 to 1976. Only for those in the highest income categories (over $25,600 in 1976 dollars adjusted for inflation) have rates of participation in college declined significantly, decreasing by 10 percent. No significant change was noted for those with lower income levels.

There has been some change relative to rates of enrollment of men and women, with rates of enrollment for males decreasing and women increasing. This is attributed to the effects of the Vietnam War and draft law policies. Suter (1978) suggests that the key observation to be made from census figures is that the large disparities between college enrollment rates of persons in low-income and high-income families continues into the 1970's. This implies continued stress on equal access and aid to the lowest income families should continue to enjoy high priority in federal policy.

Gladieux and Hansen (1978) discuss similar findings and note that some middle-income families, because of individual circumstances, do have problems meeting college expenses. They suggest that middle class families may be more ambivalent about the benefits of a college education than they were a decade ago and that this may indicate changing attitudes toward higher education.

The Congressional Budget Office (1978a, b) issued two reports that discussed the issues of rising college costs and participation rates at different income levels in the context of pending proposals in the Congress. They reported that costs at both public and private institutions had risen by roughly 75 percent during the period 1967-76. The consumer price index for that same time rose by only 70.5 percent, while family income increased 88.6 percent. Thus the CBO reported that real college costs, adjusted for inflation, rose only 2.2 percent at public institutions and 3.7 percent at private institutions, while during the same time median family income increased by 10.6 percent. The CBO conclusions were that the claim of an increased burden of college expenses for the middle-income family was not supported by data available on family income, college fees, and student aid. Additional research by Froomkin (1978) and Karr (1978) support these findings. Longanecker (1978) expanded the CBO analysis by examining family income after taxes. While noting that data available on after-tax income was less reliable than the family income levels used in the other analysis, he concluded that the burden of college costs did not seem to be increasing.

Middle Income: Squeeze

Other scholars have come to different conclusions regarding the existence of a middle-income squeeze. Van Alstyne (1978) argues that the data previously cited does not correspond with continuing public perceptions of the economic phenomena of college costs.

She suggests that aggregation of the data may be obscuring actual trends in institutional segments with increasing enrollments in the lower-cost, two-year colleges holding down average tuition increases. Including room-and-board costs in most average data is also criticized for masking trends in tuition costs. Her conclusions suggest use of after-tax income as a more realistic measure of the incomes of families, since state, local, and social security taxes, all of which have risen in recent years, would thus be reflected; this would present more realistic data on the financial pressures involved in supporting children in college. Adjustments in data for families with more than one income and for more than one child in college at the same time are also suggested. Using such adjustments, data are presented showing increased pressure on middle-income families.

Other possible evidence of a squeeze is offered by Boyd, Fenske, and Maxey (1978), who report a continuing trend of reduced parental contributions to student assistance under the expected level of support shown in calculations of financial need. They suggest possible unanticipated effects of federal student assistance programs are having an impact on family attitudes and in the way families participate in the financing of higher education. Nelson et al. (1974, 1978) have discussed parental attitudes concerning support for dependent students in two studies. Based on data drawn from need-analysis documents in 1974, they found parents generally contributing to the support of dependent students at the expected level of support according to the methodology of the College Scholarship Service. Fife (1975), using data drawn from surveys of student recipients of state financial aid from the same academic year, found evidence of decreasing parental support. Nelson's 1978 study, using information collected in 1976-77, suggested that parental attitudes have changed. Substantial variation was found between what was expected according to CSS methodology and what was offered by parents. The amount to be contributed decreased as income increased, suggesting further evidence for increasing pressure on middle-class families.

Using another approach, Peng (1977) and Peng, Stafford, and Talbert (1977), with data from the National Longitudinal Study describe decreases in college entry level among students from high and middle socioeconomic levels and shifts in those same entries from four-year to two-

Percent of 18- to 24-year-old Dependent Family Members[a] Enrolled in College, by Family Income,[b] October 1967 to October 1976

	Percent Enrolled									
Family Income	**1967**	**1968**	**1969**	**1970**	**1971**	**1972**	**1973**	**1974**	**1975**	**1976**
$ 0—$ 8,525	20.0	22.5	24.8	20.8	22.8	22.6	20.1	20.3	23.5	22.4
$ 8,525—$17,050	37.9	38.5	38.8	36.6	35.4	34.2	31.2	31.7	35.1	36.3
$17,050—$25,575	51.9	50.7	50.8	48.4	46.4	44.2	42.7	41.4	45.4	47.5
$25,575+	68.3	63.0	65.2	61.7	61.8	56.9	56.6	57.5	59.6	58.2
All income groups	39.1	39.7	41.3	39.1	38.9	37.8	36.6	36.2	38.7	38.8

aA dependent family member is a relative of the primary family head other than the wife.
bFamily income in 1976 dollars, civilian noninstitutional population.
Source: CBO calculations based on data supplied by the Census Bureau. (Congressional Budget Office 1978a p. 9.)

year college enrollments. This observation supports the possibility that rising costs in middle-income families are encouraging attendance at lower-cost institutions. Leslie (1977) also reports college choice as measured by enrollments by level has been reduced for low- and middle-income individuals.

Unfortunately, the data under discussion is not all comparable. There is evidence that supports the existence of financial pressure on middle-income families that force choices lower in cost or based on cost for middle-income participation in higher education. As previously discussed, there is also data that supports conclusions of no middle-income squeeze. Further determinations will have to take place in future research.

Other Considerations

Another body of data that is relevant to participation rates and for what may exist as declines in enrollment rates for middle-income families is the considerable body of literature that relates the effect of price (tuition) on demand (enrollment). Hyde (1978a) has summarized major research relating tuition and enrollment.

Student financial aid also effects both price and demand. Surveys of recipients of student aid (Leslie and Fife 1974; Fife 1975; Carlson 1974 1973; Boyd and Fenske, 1975; Jackson 1977) show that while grants of financial aid affect the choice of institution, the effect of student aid on enrollment is less than the effect of a change in tuition. In other words, enrollments increase or decrease more when tuition changes than when student aid changes by the same amount. Student aid offers do, however, affect the institutional choice. Grants are considered more effective than loans or work-study programs in relation to enrollment decisions. The effect of offering aid to a student is seen as the key factor in enrollment decisions.

Conclusions

Federal assistance to students has expanded rapidly since 1972. In many respects institutions of higher education and researchers in the field are only now coming to recognize the profound effects that new federal policies are exerting on higher education. Continued inflation has only served to complicate the situation, as rapidly rising prices have created pressures for increased levels of student assistance. Beginning with the current fiscal year, these programs will be expanded at the federal level to more families in middle-income levels and perhaps to independent students. Pressure exists, especially from the two-year colleges, to expand these programs to part-time students (i.e. less than 6 units) in addition to those presently benefiting from these policies.

There are limitations to all of the research discussed. Few replication studies have been completed that would clear up ambiguities in available data. Data bases are becoming more available through both the National Center for Education Statistics National Longitudinal Study (NLS) and the Cooperative Institutional Research Project (CIRP) sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA and the American Council on Education. This may allow for more use of comparable data in the future.

Families and values toward higher education may be changing too. Most research discussed in this paper has been concerned with family incomes and dependent students ages 18 to 24. Many families now have two income sources. Independent students are becoming a more significant factor in college enrollment, especially in the two- and four-year public colleges (Fife 1976). Expansion of existing federal student aid programs to independent and part-time students will undoubtedly affect both the size of student assistance efforts and the research that discusses effect of price, demand, and student aid on enrollment. Little research is currently available that describes families with multiple incomes or families with more than one child in college at the same time; research on independent students, especially in the 18-to-24 age group, is also scarce; more research is needed that reflects unrepresented populations; and research is also needed that documents the effect of policies outside of averages and aggregates such that the effect of current policies on individuals is more apparent.

There are two dilemmas here. The first is the advancement of theory and specific analysis of college costs, college enrollments, and student assistance has been rapidly increasing in the past six years. Now, even as sophistication increases, the parameters of federal programs are changing in response to policy directions that researchers have yet to address. This makes it less likely that policy decisions will be made on the basis of theoretical designs supported by empirical results. Such new policy directions as middle-income student assistance make such research more difficult with more pressure to assess new programs and new directions rather than to build a body of theory, models, and methodology that will provide tools (Hyde 1978a) for reliable research now and in the future.

The second dilemma is discussed by Augenblick and Hyde (1979), who note the lack of fundamental agreement on the extent of society's responsibilities to provide education opportunities for its citizens. Leslie (1978) has found implications that tuition prices at public institutions are the result of evolutionary processes rather than planning that develops tuition levels that conform with an openly debated and agreed upon state policy. Lack of such agreement may be part of the pluralistic tradition in American higher education, however it also leaves higher education policy and price levels open to economic and political forces.

Higher education does appear to enjoy the continued support of the public and governmental policy. Recent increases in both college costs and student assistance programs would appear to come close to balancing each other, considering averages and not always individuals. So long as federal policy continues to call for equal access and provide for income distribution that supports a pluralistic system of higher education, the progress of the last decade toward the goal of equal access will continue. Should financial aid programs begin to fall behind the perceived costs and benefits of higher education, or should federal policy shift away from the priority placed on higher education in the postwar decades, there would be immediate consequences throughout the enterprise of higher education. So far any evidence of a middle class squeeze and changing values toward higher education seems limited to enrollment shifts toward lower cost public institutions and concerns for levels of parental contribution's expected by the various forms of need analysis. These trends should be closely followed. Further steps toward integrated data bases to combine the best economic analysis in broadly agreed to formats should be taken. Additional research and coordination between state level and federal level policies on pricing and enrollment effect need to be carried out. Finally, continued efforts to relate the goals and values of higher education to the public purposes of governmental assistance that aids higher education should be made to assure continued understanding of the benefits society receives from higher education.

The consequences of changing values toward higher education, should they develop beyond the limited evidence that currently exists, would be many. There would be additional pressures on the government for increased student subsidies. Parents would become increasingly hostile in their dealings with institutions and agencies administering student financial aid. The activities, performance, and accountability of higher education institutions would come under greater scrutiny. Since existing federal programs are not built into any mandatory en-

titlement programs, political or economic pressures could result in major shifts in policy, the effect of which could be drastic for institutions that have grown dependent on indirect federal support through student assistance programs. Yet, as long as the public continues to demand support for education and sees education as one of the most worthwhile of public expenditures, these consequences are unlikely. What is most likely is a continued shifting of the burden of financing higher education from individuals to the federal and state governments. This represents a changing value toward higher education whose effects are just beginning to make themselves felt.

Bibliography

Boyd, Joseph D. and Fenske, Robert H. *A Longitudinal Study of Illinois State Scholarship Commission Honorary Awards Recipients 1967-74.* Deerfield, Ill.: Illinois State Scholarship Commission, 1975. ED 112 787. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Boyd, Joseph D.; Fenske, Robert H.; and Maxey, E. James. "Trends in Meeting College Costs over the Past Ten Years." *Journal of Student Financial Aid* 8 (November 1978): 5-17.

Bureau of the Census. *Current Population Reports: (Series P-20, No. 319). School Enrollment Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1976.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. UD 010 613. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

Carlson, Daryl E. *A Flow of Funds Model for Assessing the Impact of Alternative Student Aid Programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1975. ED 123 992. MF-$0.98; HC-$8.01.

_____. "Student Price Response Coefficients for Grants, Loans, Work-Study Aid, and Tuition Changes: An Analysis of Student Surveys." Copublished manuscript. Davis: Department of Agricultural Economics, University of California, November 1974.

Congressional Budget Office. *Federal Aid to Postsecondary Students: Tax Allowances and Alternative Subsidies.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. ED 153 517. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

_____. *Federal Assistance for Postsecondary Education: Options for Fiscal Year 1979.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. ED 156 038. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Fife, Jonathan D. *The College Student Grant Study.* University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1975. ED 112 794. MF-$0.98; HC-$3.98.

_____. "The Independent Student and Student Aid Programs." *Research Currents.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education/ERIC-Higher Education, (June 1976). ED 125 501. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.45.

Finn, Chester E. *Scholars, Dollars, and Bureaucrats.* Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Froomkin, Joseph., "Middle Income Students and the Cost of Education." *Educational Record* 59 (Summer 1978): 254-67.

Gladieux, Lawrence E. and Hansen, Janet. *Middle Income Students: A New Target for Federal Aid.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978. ED 156 078. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Hyde, Jr., William D. *The Effect of Tuition and Financial Aid on Access and Choice in Postsecondary Education.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1978(a). ED 153 541. MF-$0.98; HC-$3.98.

_____. *Student Financial Aid Proposals and the Middle Income Squeeze: Tax Credits or Expansion of Basic Grants.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1978(b). ED 157 456. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Hyde, William and Augenlick, John. *Patterns of Funding, Net Price and Financial Need for Postsecondary Education Students. Differences Among States, Institutional Sectors and Income Groups.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1979. HE 010 988. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Jackson, Gregory A. "Financial Aid and Student Enrollment." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (November-December 1978): 548-574.

_____. "Financial Aid to Students and the Demand for Postsecondary Education." Ph. D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1977.

Karr, John. "Selected Statistics Regarding Income and College Costs." Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 1978 (mimeograph).

Leslie, Larry L. *Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington DC.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 142 125. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

_____ and Fife, Jonathan D. "The College Student Grant Study." *Journal of Higher Education* 45 (December 1974): 651-71.

Longanecker, David. "Ability to Pay for Student Costs of Higher Education Taking into Account Family Income After Taxes." Transcript of a paper presented to American Council on Education Research/Analysis Seminar, July 7, 1978. ED 156 085. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

Lynch, Mitchell C. "As College Costs Soar, Middle Income Families Are Caught in Squeeze." *The Wall Street Journal* 189 (May 25, 1977): 1, 32.

Nelson, James. "Are Parents Expected to Pay too Much?" *The College Board Review* 92 (Summer 1974).

Nelson, James E., Van Dusen, William, and Jocobson, Edmund C. *The Willingness of Parents to Contribute to Postsecondary Educational Expenses.* Prepared by the College Entrance Examination Board under contract to the Office of Planning Budgeting and Evaluation, U.S. Office to Education,Washington, D.C., 1978. ED 150 930. MF-$0.98; HC-$7.00.

National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. *Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Peng, Samuel S., "Trends in the Entry to Higher Education." *Education Researcher* 6 (January 1977): 15-18.

_____; Stafford, Celcille E.; and Talbert, Robin J. *National Longitudinal Study of High School Class of 1972: Review of Annotation of Study Reports.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. 1977. ED 151 370, MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

"Private Colleges Cry Help." *Time* (January 15, 1979): 38-40.

Suter, Larry E. "Elementary and Secondary School Progression, High School Graduation and College Entrance of the American Population 1950 to 1978." In *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization,* edited by Kerchhoff. Forthcoming.

U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy.* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1947.

Van Alstyne, Carol F. "Is There or Isn't There a Middle Income Crunch." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, September 1978 and January 1979 (mimeograph). HE 010 987. MF-$0.98; HC-$7.15. RIE. June 1979.

To order documents in the bibliography by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Resources in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and HC denotes hard copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00; and all orders must be in writing.